TARSUS.

XI. The Greeks in Tarsus.

The events in Cilicia in 171 B.C., described in the previous chapter of this study, introduced a new period in the history of Tarsus. It was henceforth a Greek city-state, governing itself in all internal matters through its own elective magistrates, and exercising certain sovereign rights such as the striking of its own autonomous coins. In various respects, and especially in all relations to foreign states, Tarsus undoubtedly must have been subject to the Seleucid kings: that was a necessity of the Empire. The relation of a free city such as Tarsus now was, to the central government of the Seleucid Empire is, however, quite obscure; and until some of the cities of this class are excavated and the whole subject carefully studied, it is impossible to speak about details.

For our present purposes it is extremely important to determine what was the character of the constituent population of the free city of Tarsus. It would consist of the former population together with a certain body of new citizens, introduced in the manner and for the purpose already described. All that can be learned or conjectured about the older city has been already stated in the preceding chapter. It now remains to ask what evidence can be found as to the new citizens introduced in 171–170 B.C.

It has been shown[1] that in their colonial foundations, the Seleucid kings were obliged to trust mainly to two peoples, the Greeks and the Jews, "to manage, to lead, to train the rude Oriental peasantry in the arts on which civilized life must rest, to organize and utilize their labour

[1] *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 130.

and create a commercial system." This class of colonists was even more necessary than soldiers in those colonies.

The Greeks in those Hellenic foundations of Asia Minor were drawn from very diverse sources. The coins, which are our chief authority, mention Achaeans at Eumeneia, Dorians and Ionians at Synnada, Macedonians frequently. We know that Pisidian Antioch was colonized by settlers from Magnesia, and many other examples might be quoted. How and in what circumstances it was that the settlers were selected in each case, no record exists. We can only conjecture in what manner the superabundant population of Greece, finding their own narrow, barren country unfit to offer a career for their energies, poured forth now at one outlet, now at another, as the opportunity was offered in the new foundations established by the Greek kings in western Asia. Such had been the history of Greece in earlier centuries, when Greek cities founded their own colonies. Such is now the case in modern times, when no new cities on the Mediterranean coasts can be founded, and still Greek emigrants go forth in numbers to push their fortunes as the trade of the neighbouring lands opens up.

The Greek settlers in Tarsus and in Cilicia generally at this period seem to have been Argives. Dion Chrysostom addresses the Tarsians as "colonists of the Argives." Strabo, who had visited the city, and Stephanus give the same account. The chief magistrates in Tarsus and in several other Cilician cities bore the Dorian title Demiourgos, which may be taken as a definite proof that the Greek element in the population was mainly Dorian. It is therefore certain that the Tarsians prided themselves on being Dorians of Argos, and that their municipal institutions had something of a Dorian character. It seems also not impossible that some Doric tinge may have marked the Greek

that they spoke; and, though the scanty inscriptions show no trace of this, such evidence could hardly be expected. The Koine, the common Hellenistic dialect, would naturally establish itself quickly in a city like Tarsus; and only a few traces of the Doric dialect may perhaps have lingered. Elsewhere I have used this Doric character in Tarsus as foundation for a suggestion that the origin of the Western text of Acts should perhaps be sought there [1]; the word ναοκόρος used for νεωκόρος in Acts xix. 35 in the Bezan Greek is just such a trace as might have survived in Tarsus.

An Argive connexion dating only from 171 B.C. did not satisfy the Tarsian pride of antiquity. The Hellenistic cities of that time loved to invent an origin for themselves in remote Greek mythology. The Tarsians claimed to be descended from the Argives who had gone forth along with Triptolemus in search of the lost Io, the beloved of the god, transformed into a cow by the anger of Hera. It belonged to the ancient Greek mind to seek a mythological prototype and divine guarantee for historical facts; the first Tarsian Greeks from the Argive land readily believed that they were doing what their ancestors in the heroic age had done; and this mythological fable soon established itself as the faith of the city. But the same people, who spoke of themselves as descendants of those ancient Argive wanderers, felt no inconsistency in declaring that Tarsus was the foundation of Sardanapalos, and an old Oriental city. Both Strabo and Stephanus of Byzantium repeat these contradictory legends, as if they were quite harmonious.

Modern writers about Tarsus have usually interpreted the mythological tale as furnishing evidence that Tarsus was really colonized from Argos in the remote beginnings of Greek settlement on the Cilician coast. This is a false view of the nature of Greek myth, and inconsistent with

[1] *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 154.

the known facts. The primitive Greek settlers on this coast were "Sons of the Ionian," and came to Cilicia under the direction of the Clarian Apollo, a god of the Ionian coast. They had necessarily and inevitably melted into the Cilician ground-stock, and Tarsus had long become an almost purely Oriental town, in which there is no reason to think that Demiourgoi or any other Greek magistrates were elected. When the new Hellenic city of Tarsus was founded in 171 B.C., the titles and character of the magistrates were determined by the facts of the stituation and the origin of the only Greek population in the city, viz. the newly enrolled Greek citizens—not by mythological inventions, which grew more slowly and took their tone from the established institutions of the city.

The use of the term Demiourgos in other cities of Cilicia suggests that Antiochus established some connexion about this time with the land of Argos, and settled bodies of Argives in other Cilician cities whose constitution he remodelled, though in smaller numbers than at Tarsus. Only in Tarsus were the numbers and influence of the Greeks sufficient to constitute at this time a really sovereign Greek City-State, so far as imperial control permitted sovereignty in such a city. The inscriptions of Soloi-Pompeiopolis, near Tarsus, contain considerable traces of Doric dialect.

XII. The Jews in Tarsus.

This section is the most important and fundamental, so far as St. Paul is concerned, in the study of Tarsian history. On the results of this section must depend all our ideas as to the position which the Apostle's family occupied in Tarsus, as to his own origin and birthright, and as to many allied questions.

It is clearly the presumption in the book of Acts that

there was a considerable body of Jews in Tarsus. Paul was at home there among friends of his own race. That this is true to fact hardly any one is likely to dispute; and it may seem not worth while to prove it by formal evidence. Yet so jealous and sometimes so arbitrary is the fashion in which the book of Acts is usually treated by scholars that a passage of Epiphanius may be quoted about the Jews of Tarsus. In the first book of his treatise against Heresies, No. xxx. (Migne, vol. 41, Epiphanius i. pp. 411–427), he gives an extremely interesting account of a Jew named Joseph, born at Tiberias about A.D. 286,[1] whom Epiphanius had himself known, and from whose lips he had heard the whole story of his life. Joseph, who belonged to a family of high standing and influence in Tiberias, became interested in the Christian teaching, but his thoughts were for a long time carefully hidden from his co-religionists; he was entrusted with the honourable dignity and duties of an Apostle among them, and finally despatched on a mission with letters to the Jews of Cilicia. He collected from every city of Cilicia the tithes and the firstfruits paid by the Jews in that Province. In a certain city he chanced to be lodged in a house beside the church, and he thus became acquainted and even intimate with the bishop. From the bishop he borrowed a copy of the Gospels, and read the book.

Now Joseph had exercised the powers of the Apostolate with such strictness that he became extremely unpopular with many of the Jews, who began to scrutinize his conduct carefully in the hope of finding some charge to bring against him. Seeking their opportunity, they rushed suddenly into his abode, and caught him in the act of reading the Gospels. They snatched the book out of his hands, seized

[1] See M. Clermont Ganneau in *Quart. Statement Pal. Expl. Fund*, 1901, p. 382.

him and dragged him with blows and shouts and other ill-treatment to the synagogue, and there flogged him. The bishop, hearing of this, hurried to the scene and rescued him from the hands of the Jews.

On another occasion the Jews caught Joseph while travelling, and threw him into the Cydnus. He was carried away by the current, and they thought with delight that he was drowned; but he escaped. Shortly afterwards he joined the Christians, was baptized, and afterwards promoted to the dignity of a count (*comes*) and member of the Privy Council (*amicus*) of the Emperor Constantine.

In this account Tarsus is not named, but it is mentioned that there were Jews in every city of Cilicia. It is clearly implied, too, that the Cilician Jews were numerous and powerful, otherwise they could not under Christian rule have ventured on such vigorous action against one who was suspected of a leaning towards Christianity. The story plainly shows that no punishment or prosecution took place on account of their assault, though its illegal character is evident (even allowing that considerable freedom was permitted by law to Jews in dealing with a Jew). The fact that the bishop was able to rescue Joseph as soon as he heard of the first assault proves that even in flogging a presumed Christian convert, the Jews were overstepping the authority of the synagogue: while the second and murderous assault was in any circumstances and with any provocation a serious breach of Imperial law. These facts are inexplicable, unless the Cilician Jews had been a powerful body.

Tarsus would certainly be their chief seat in the Province, because it was the centre of trade and finance, and offered the best opportunities for money-making. It would also, naturally, be the place where Joseph took up his abode, when he went to Cilicia on public duty, for it was

the one city from which all the rest could be best affected and where there was most frequent opportunity of coming into contact with the whole of the Cilician Jews. Finally, the Jews of the town where he lived threw him into the Cydnus, therefore they were the Tarsian Jews. They watched their opportunity when Joseph started on a journey towards Mallos or some place on that side, and threw him into the river.[1] He must have been travelling in that direction, because the river is not deep enough to carry away a man in its current, except in the lower part of its course, and Joseph would not have touched the lower course of the river, unless he had been going towards Mallos. Why Epiphanius avoids mentioning the name of Tarsus, and merely speaks of "a certain city," I cannot explain. Perhaps he wished to avoid bringing such a charge against the city by name.

In passing we observe several interesting points in this story. In the first place the feeling between Jews and Christians was very bitter and intolerant; but it was almost as strong between Jews and pagans or Samaritans. The Jews would not permit any Greek (i.e. pagan), or Samaritan, or Christian to live in the district of Galilee where they were strongest; it had been impossible to build a church in any of the towns or villages there, and especially in Tiberias, Sepphoris, Nazareth, and Capernaum. Such a fact is not favourable to the existence of an unbroken Christian tradition in those towns.

On the other hand there was some intercourse privately between individual Jews and Christians. Joseph was on friendly terms with the bishop of Tarsus, while he was still a Jewish Apostle. Hillel, the Patriarch of Tiberias,

[1] The supposition that the Jews of some other city followed Joseph for such a distance as to be able to throw him into the Cydnus is violent and improbable.

when near death, summoned the bishop who was nearest that city to visit him.[1] The pretext was that the bishop's services as a physician were required; but every Jew in Tiberias must soon have been aware that a Christian bishop was attending their Patriarch, even though they did not know that he was secretly administering the sacrament. In later times such a visit could hardly have occurred. We observe, also, that it is assumed by all that the bishop was qualified to act as a physician. The importance of the medical profession in the Lycaonian and Cappadocian Church during the fourth century was described in the EXPOSITOR, January 1906, p. 42. It would almost appear that the bishop was expected to possess some medical skill, which should be at the service of his congregation and of strangers.

There is, accordingly, no doubt that a strong body of Jews inhabited Tarsus. The only question is as to their status in the city: were they merely resident strangers, or had they the full rights of citizens, i.e. of burgesses? The difference in a Hellenic city was profound. There were in all the chief commercial cities of the Mediterranean coasts large bodies of such resident strangers. Many of these became permanent inhabitants of the city, and their families lived there generation after generation. But such persons did not become citizens by right of birth or hereditary connexion with the city. They and their descendants remained outside of the city (in the Hellenic sense). They had no share in its patriotism and its religion. They could freely retain and practise their own religious rites, however alien these were to the religion of the city where they lived. It was usual for a group of such resident

[1] The Latin translation in the Migne edition calls him the bishop of Tiberias; but this is a false rendering of the Greek. No Christians were allowed to live in Tiberias.

strangers to form themselves into a religious association for the proper celebration of their own ritual. Thus they carried their own religion with them into the heart of Greece and were protected by Greek law in the performance of ritual which was forbidden to true citizens—though this prohibition was rarely enforced and practically almost inoperative. It was in this way that foreign and Oriental religions spread in the Greek cities, though nominally forbidden on pain of death and stigmatized as unworthy, superstitious, and un-Hellenic by the more educated among the people.

Especially the Jews dwelt in considerable bodies in various Hellenic cities, where they did not possess any rights as burgess-citizens, forming a simple association with synagogue or place of prayer by seashore or on the bank of a stream (as at Philippi), which aroused attention and attracted proselytes, though it repelled and was hated by the majority.

The question arises whether the Jews at Tarsus were mere resident strangers of this kind. This seems disproved by all that can be gathered about that city.

The view which we take is that the Jews of Tarsus were, as a body, citizens with full burgess rights. That does not, of course, exclude the possibility that there were some or even many resident stranger Jews in the city. The right of citizenship could only be got by inheritance, apart from exceptional cases in which it was bestowed by a formal law on an individual as a reward for services rendered to the city; but such cases were comparatively few in any one city,[1] for the right was jealously guarded. There was no desire to increase the number of citizens, but rather

[1] It would, of course, be easy to collect from all the Greek cities a list of many individuals to whom citizenship was granted and recorded in inscriptions that have been preserved.

the aim of everybody was to keep the number small: philosophers and social theorists taught that the ideal of a city could be attained only in a comparatively limited size, while the ordinary selfish individual thought that the advantages of citizenship would be diminished if they were shared with new citizens.

There were occasional crises in the history of a Greek City-State, when the number of citizens was enlarged by the incorporation of considerable groups of new members. Such crises were, naturally, exceptional and rare: they occurred from various causes—sometimes on account of a great disaster, which had seriously weakened the State and diminished the body of citizens to a dangerous extent, sometimes through external causes and the interference of a power outside the State. In such cases the body of new citizens was not, as a rule, incorporated in any of the older Tribes of the city, but in a new Tribe which was instituted for the purpose.[1]

Now there is no evidence, and no probability, that the body of the citizens of Tarsus was ever enlarged in this way, after it had been founded as a Greek City-State by Antiochus Epiphanes in 171. While we are only imperfectly acquainted with the history of Tarsus, there is no sign that any such crisis ever occurred. The reasonable probability is that the foundation of 171 was permanent, and determined the constitution of the city until the time of Augustus, when there was an oligarchic and timocratic movement, limiting the number of burgesses instead of increasing them, and making a money qualification.

The reasons for the view that there was a body of Jewish citizens in Tarsus are as follows.

[1] On the "Tribes" into which the population of a Hellenic city was divided, see the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, pp. 146–150, or any work on Greek Antiquities.

In the first place, St. Paul was a citizen, as he himself asserted most emphatically in very dramatic circumstances at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 39). This implies that he was a member of one of the Tribes into which those Hellenic Colonies were always divided. Now the members of a Tribe were closely bound to one another by common religious rites, which were performed at every meeting of the Tribe. In every Hellenic city the common religion of the Tribe was an extremely important element in the life and the thought and the patriotism of all citizens. No man could be a citizen except as a member of a Tribe; and the tribal bond was sacred and intimate. Now no Jew could possibly become a member of an ordinary Tribe in a Greek city, because he would have been obliged to participate frequently in a pagan ritual, which even the most degraded of Jews would hardly have faced. There was no possible way by which Jews could become citizens of a Greek city, except by having a Tribe set apart for them, in which they could control the religious rites and identify them with the service of the synagogue. This method was adopted in Alexandria, where the Jews were all enrolled in the Tribe called "the Macedonians"; and there can be no doubt that the same method was followed in all the Seleucid foundations, where a Jewish body of colonists was settled.

Accordingly, inasmuch as St. Paul was a Tarsian citizen and his father before him was a citizen, there must have been a body of Jewish citizens constituting the Tribe in which they were enrolled. There can never have been a single Jewish citizen of a Greek city: there must always have been a group of Jews forming a Tribe, holding together in virtue of their common Jewish religion; and it may be regarded as practically certain that the synagogue was their tribal centre, where they met not only for religious purposes, but also for judging all cases affecting their tribal

union and rights. In this way Joseph of Tiberias was dragged to the synagogue and there flogged, as has just been described.

This train of reasoning seems indisputable; and it has been fully accepted by Professor E. Schürer.[1] Yet such indirect arguments, however unanswerable they be, never can carry the same complete conviction to the reader as a definite and direct proof that there was in Tarsus a body of Jewish citizens; and our next argument is that such a proof is furnished by Romans xvi. 7–21, where six persons are called "kinsmen" by St. Paul. The word can hardly mean here kinsmen by right of birth and blood in the ordinary sense[2]; for there is reason to think that the family to which the Apostle belonged had not come over to the Christian Church in such numbers, but rather had condemned his action and rejected him.[3] Nor can it here mean simply members of the Jewish nation, for many of the others who are mentioned in this passage without this epithet were undoubtedly Jews. The careful distinction between the various epithets in the passage is very instructive. The writer was deeply moved, and his tenderest feelings were roused, when he was writing the words, and each epithet is full of emotion, a piece of his heart and his life, as it were. I believe that there is in the term "kinsmen" here an instance of the same strong deep feeling for his native city, which is found in Acts xxi. 39 (as was pointed out in the preceding chapter): the word "kinsman" here means fellow-citizen and doubtless also fellow-tribesman, for all the six were probably Jews and therefore members of the same Tribe in Tarsus. This use of the word

[1] See his article on the Jews of the Diaspora, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v. p. 105.

[2] "Kinsmen according to the flesh" in Romans ix. 3.

[3] *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 35 ff., 310–312.

"kinsmen" was idiomatically Greek, and seems to have risen in other cases to the mouth of the Greek when his feelings of patriotism were moved.[1] Thus, for example, when the Greeks of Ephesus came to Agrippa to ask him to eject their Jewish fellow-citizens from participation in the rights of citizenship,[2] they declared that "if the Jews are kinsmen to us, they ought to worship our gods," i.e. to practise the religion of the city, participation in which was the natural and (to the Greek mind) necessary expression of patriotism and kinship. This kindred, which is spoken of as existing between the Jews of Ephesus and the Greeks of Ephesus, was their common citizenship; and it was in the same sense that Paul calls those six men his "kinsmen" in Romans xvi. 7, 11, 21.

In the third place, a proof of the existence of a body of Jewish citizens in Tarsus can be drawn from a passage in Philostratus's biography of Apollonius of Tyana, vi. 34. Not long after the end of the Jewish insurrection and the capture of Jerusalem, Titus, as co-Emperor with his father, chanced to be offering public sacrifice on behalf of the State (probably in Rome), when delegates representing the city of Tarsus approached him with a petition about some important interests of their city. These ambassadors were, it is needless to say, citizens of Tarsus. Titus answered that he would himself act as their ambassador to his father Vespasian, and lay their case before him. Hereupon Apollonius, who was present in the train of his friend Titus, intervened and said to him, "If I prove to you that some of these delegates are enemies of your father and yourself, and went as envoys to Jerusalem to promote an insurrection,

[1] An examination of the meaning and use of *συγγενής* and *συγγένεια* in Greek is much needed. The lexicons, even Steph. Thesaurus, rarely give any help in such matters.

[2] See the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 152; Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xii. 3, 2, § 126.

making themselves secret allies of your most openly declared enemies, what treatment shall they receive of you ?" "What," said Titus, "but death ?" "Is it not then disgraceful," replied Apollonius, "to take vengeance on the spot, but to postpone kindnesses to a later time, to inflict death on your own responsibility, but to reserve favours until you consult another about them ?"

This dilemma which Apollonius put to Titus depended for its effect on the fact (which must have been well known) that many Jews were citizens of Tarsus. Apollonius was on bad terms with that city,[1] and Titus was quite prepared to hear him denounce the Tarsians; and also, as there were many Jewish citizens in Tarsus, he was quite ready to believe that some of the envoys were Jews, and that the suggestion that they had been plotting treason in Jerusalem was seriously intended. In truth, it is highly probable that some of the envoys were Jews, and that this suggested to Apollonius the stratagem which he practised. No person would have thought of suggesting or believing that Greeks would have gone on an embassy to Jerusalem to plot treason with Jews: the race hatred was notoriously too strong and bitter.

The seeming accusation which Apollonius made with such ready wit must have been a plausible and probable one in itself, otherwise Titus would not have been taken in by it. Its only plausibility arose from the Jewish citizenship in Tarsus, and the known fact that many wealthy and prominent Tarsians were Jews. When Apollonius retorted

[1] Philostratus mentions this. Apollonius on his visit to Tarsus had sternly rebuked the Tarsians for their luxury and wealth, and became extremely unpopular in the city. After the incident with Titus, Tarsian feeling changed and he was reverenced as a benefactor and "founder" of the city. The title "founder" was often bestowed by the Hellenic cities on persons who had done special service to a city, or caused some advantage, or built some public building.

with his sharp-pointed dilemma, Titus was charmed. Though he had been caught in the act of threatening death as the punishment for a supposititious and pretended crime, he extricated himself from the unpleasant situation with the genial humour characteristic of both his father and himself, granting the Tarsians' petition, and saying that his father would pardon him for yielding to truth and to Apollonius.

All these three arguments unite in this, that each shows us a situation and words which are full of meaning and point, if there were Jewish citizens in Tarsus, but insipid and pointless if there were not. Considering how scanty is the information that has come down to us about the constitution of Tarsus and the other Hellenic cities of Asia Minor, it is fortunate that on this important matter so much evidence has been preserved, and that a body of Jewish citizens can confidently be regarded as having formed an important element in the Tarsian City-State. Our conclusion is that Dorian Greeks from Argos and Jews formed the main body of the new colonists settled there by Antiochus Epiphanes in 171–170 B.C.

XIII. The Jews settled in Tarsus in 171 B.C.

The next question is when this body of Jewish citizens was settled in Tarsus. We have seen that they must have been settled there as a body, and not from time to time as ndividuals; that the settlement must have formed part of a general reconstruction of the city; that there was such a reconstruction of Tarsus in 171 B.C.; and that there is no sign or evidence of any later reconstruction having occurred. The natural inference is that a body of Jews was settled in Tarsus by Antiochus Epiphanes, as part of the free self-governing city which he founded in that year. I see no way in which this inference can be evaded.

Such a settlement was in accordance with the regular Seleucid practice. Similar settlements of Jews had been made in many other cases by the predecessors of Antiochus, and on an especially large scale by his father in the cities of Lydia and Phrygia not long before. Even if there were no record of Jewish citizens in Tarsus, it would be safe to speak of the probability that he followed the established Seleucid principle, and settled Jews as citizens in Tarsus.

Professor E. Schürer, however, though he cannot suggest any way of evading this inference, argues that it "appears very improbable in view of the hostility of Antiochus to the Jews." Antiochus, it is true, became the enemy of the rebel Jews in Palestine; but that was at a later time. In 171 he considered himself as the best friend of the Jewish race, and was so considered by many of the most influential Jews in Jerusalem. He regarded Jerusalem with special interest, and as a token of his favour bestowed on it his own name. To the Jewish reactionary party, who carried out their successful revolt, it seemed an outrage to rename Jerusalem "Antiocheia"; but Antiochus was innocent of any such intention. The truth was that the king merely carried into effect a great scheme of national education in Palestine, the best that the philosophers of the time could conceive; and that the scheme was highly popular with the aristocracy, but hated by the common people of the country. This scheme of national education was not even originated by Antiochus. It had been the settled policy of the Seleucid kings since they became the lords of Palestine. Antiochus Epiphanes merely walked in the beaten path, the ultimate aim of which was to educate Palestine and all the rest of the Seleucid dominions in Greek civilization, language, and manners. Those who still regard the study of Greek as so valuable that it should be enforced in every school in our remote age and land, ought not to

accuse Antiochus of outrage and hostility because he wished to teach Greek in Jerusalem and to bring the Jews up to the level of the highest civilization (as he believed) of the time.

This way of describing the situation in Palestine before the Maccabaean rising is no frivolous trifling with a serious subject. It is the literal truth, and it is also the spiritual truth. The Seleucid policy, which Antiochus Epiphanes continued, was a noble and generous one, and produced excellent results in Western Asia generally. It attempted, wisely, deliberately, and with full consciousness, to produce a conciliation and amalgamation of Oriental ideas and Western education ; and in many ways it offers still a model of the best method of essaying this most important problem in social development. But the same policy which is wise and beneficial in one country may be unwise and hurtful in another. It was quite true, as Antiochus and his predecessors saw, that the Jews had much to learn from the Greeks ; but they had more to lose than to gain by being Hellenized, if Hellenization meant the abandoning of all that was distinctive in Judaism. The Maccabaean rising was guilty of many faults and was far from being an unmixed good to the world ; but it did preserve the Jewish race from being merged in Hellenism and kept it free for its great destiny.

So successful had the Seleucid policy already been that the " advanced " party among the Jews now urged Antiochus to take more decided steps. He acted in concert with the Hellenizing Jews, who claimed to be the most enlightened and certainly were the wealthy and the powerful part of the community. The building of a gymnasium, the introduction of the fashion of young men wearing hats and in general making themselves as Hellenized as possible—such were the outrages of which Antiochus had been guilty

when the rebellion first began. These cannot be condemned by us as grave offences, in themselves; but they were an attempt to force Hellenic customs on the Jews. The gymnasium implied the Greek fashion of practising athletics naked; and this fashion was the cause of real evils in Greece. The hat has always been and still is an abomination to the true Asiatic; it is still the mark of a European in Mohammedan lands. For Jews to wear the hat was to denationalize themselves.

Antiochus, therefore, even after 171, was in no true sense an enemy of the Jews. He was only an enemy of a party among the Jews. That party became dominant in Palestine, and hence arose war with Palestine. But none of this had taken place in 171; and the same policy which made the king eager to Hellenize Palestine made him introduce Jewish colonists into Tarsus and doubtless into other Cilician towns. It is, indeed, highly probable that there were already Jews in Cilicia, and that Antiochus both bestowed the rights of citizenship in the remodelled cities on the old resident Jews, and increased their numbers by bringing into the country more families of Jews. Even after the Maccabaean war began, it is not probable that Antiochus ceased to trust or favour the Jews in the northern part of his realm. He would do so only if they joined or sympathized with the rebellion; and at first they were not likely to do so, for they were rather on the Hellenizing side. They could not live in a Hellenic city without learning that many Hellenic customs, hated by the zealots, were harmless and even good. They did not regard games and athletics with such horror as the zealots did. St. Paul draws his metaphors and similes so freely from such Greek customs that it is impossible to think even he, strict Pharisee as he claimed to be, felt any detestation of Greek games and Greek ideas: had he been the pure Jew that many

scholars fancy him to have been, he must have regarded all those Greek things as an abomination.

The conclusion is that from 171 onwards there was in Tarsus a body of citizens of Jewish blood. They were a privileged class in many ways, Josephus points out emphatically that the Seleucid kings showed great favour to all the Jewish colonists, conceded many things which the Jewish scruples required, set them free from all obligation to do anything contrary to their religion and their law. We must therefore regard St. Paul as sprung from one of the families which got the Tarsian citizenship in 171 B.C., and reject the story (in itself an impossible one) recorded by St. Jerome, that he or his parents had emigrated from Gischala in Palestine, when it was captured by the Romans.

W. M. RAMSAY.